App F IX 4

Previous References

C M 36-51-7-6-10
Mc 24-48-107-109
Rc 23-46-81

Later References

C M dep rec 31/53
CM 44 54 18
LLH LG Gc ea

19 52 53
(C M)

File No 6-52

Serial Nos 18, 19
20

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos 3

P-26
DK

Part B for Aug 52

SUBJECT

Acqn of portion of properties in Taukal Narayana Setty lane & Moramma Temple Street, Ingn, Beltg, for a Conservancy lane

L 60[illegible]-40/c m 6-52-19 91-8-52

The Commr Corpn (thro the Mg
cc Controller SAD B lane
cc Compiler Mvp Gazette
cc Auditor Corpn B'lore

(

WD 015467—GPB—25 000—12-9 51

7/8/52

G R S APP F III—1]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

( )

-NOTES- File No

FILE HEADING

Acquisition of properties in Bellary city

FROM The Commissioner Corporation of Bellary

No 4/AR 8/51-52 Dated 2-6-52 Received

Diary No 1890/mlg Enclos Spare copies Serial No

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Forwards fresh declaration G.O.Rt. dated for the acquisition of portion of property 5/2 & 6 of Venkatasalam Narayanaswamy Street and 19/22 (new) of Mariamappa Temple Street for a Conservancy lane

NOTES AND ORDERS

Collector's M 36-51 (File 7 Co) publishes fresh preliminary notifications for the acquisition of the above properties as per copy

2). Objections petitions have been filed by Sri Raja Lakshmi narayana Setty, owner of door no 5/ & 6 in the Lane and Sri Veerabhadra Chowdhuri as per petitions enclosed and Sriyuths Ramaswamy Chowdhuri as per

NOTES — First Sheet

WD 31b470—GPB—5 000 -24-9 51

petitioner awarded)

3) Held / Spot enquiry on 14-4-52 the Executive Engineer has rejected the objections in the Remarks column of his Order flagged "B"

4) The main reasons advanced by the petitioner for opposing the petition of Sri Raja Lakshmi narayana Setty are that the party (Sri Gopalakrishna Setty and his brother Sri Lakshmiah Setty) has already laid the underground connection at that time and at this stage when certain things have happened and in consequence thereof the matter may be settled amicably can be done to settle from this position, and that the piece of land in question serves no useful purpose to Sri Raja Lakshmi narayana Setty etc., if is desirable to keep it open.

5) The Collector after hearing the parties and perusal of orders passed by him on the petition of Sri Raja Lakshmi narayana Setty has also put up

6) The Commissioner has excluded the grounds of the objections in the final declaration. Statements which perhaps satisfies them

1890/Rd

Acqn of properties at Tekkasale Narayana Setty Town

7) The Collector, Tenkasi recommended vide letter dated both inspection and hearing the parties also to acquire the portions of properties in question may perhaps the proceedings the acquisition sanctioned

8) Secs for orders.

Dear 16/8/52
SD 16/8 9) Under circumstances explained by the Town Engr the acquisition of the property may be sanctioned

Secy (L&S) 16/8
10) Papers Dy 17/8/52
17/8

OF PUBL. HEALTH GOVERNMENT
17 JUN 1952
No 1622

11) 18/7/52 19/7/52
19/7

12) 's post cap for approval
26/7

Dear 25/7/52
SD 25/7/52

Secy (L&S) Issue 25/7/52
29/7

To

The commissioner, Corporation of the
city of Bangalore (thro' the Mayor)

The controller S A-D

The compiler Mysore Gazette

The Auditor Bangalore corporation

L 60 37-40/C.R. 6 S 2 19 — B

1-8-92

Note fees

GENERAL & REVENUE SECRETARIAT
1 JUN 1952
890

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF BANGALORE

No L1 Pr 3/51-52
Enc Draft notifications
3 copies of objections petition, 1 Order copy, 1 Plan

CORPORATION OFFICES
BANGALORE

Dated 2nd June 1952

FROM
B M ABU BAKER LSO M A (Hon)
COMMISSIONER,
CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF BANGALORE
BANGALORE

C Dis 6 52-18

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Local Self Government Department,
Bangalore

SIR

Subject ACQUISITION OF PORTION OF PROPERTIES IN TANKASALE NARAYANASETTY LANE & MARAMMA TEMPLE STREET, II DIVISION, BANGALORE CITY, FOR A CONSERVANCY LANE

S-MAB

With reference to the Government notification No 9277/ C M 36-51-10 dated 26th November 1951 authorising the Ex-Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Bangalore, to hear objections under section 5 (A) Land Acquisition Act on the above subject, I write to state that notices under section 4 Land Acquisition Act were served on the notified owners of the properties on 17-12-1951 and 22-12-51 respectively, calling for objections under section 5 (A) Land Acquisition Act In response, the following objection petitions have been received

1) Sri Raja Lakshminarayana Setty, owner of Door No 5/2 & 6, Tankasale Narayana Setty lane filed an objection petition on 8-1-52 through his Counsel Sri M P Somasekhara Rao, B A ,LL B Advocate, Bangalore City, protesting against the proposed acquisition and also stated that the formation of conservancy lane was not necessary
2) One Sri Lakkappa filed a petition on 4-1-52 claiming his interest on Door No 19 (old) 22(new), Maramma Temple Street
3) Sm Lakkamma filed a petition on 11-1-52 claiming her interest on Door No 19(old) 22(new), Maramma Temple Street and also raised objection on the proposed acquisition

The spot was then inspected by my predecessor on 7-4-1952 after giving due notices to the parties and personal enquiry was also held by him on 14-4-52

p t o

Final order has been passed on 14-5-1952 on the objections raised by the owners of the properties under acquisition and a copy of the same is herein enclosed for kind reference The final conclusion of the said order is, that the objection to the acquisition put forward is overruled, as the piece of land in question serves no useful purpose to the owner of property No.5/2 and 6, Tankasale Narayanasetty lane and as it is desirable to keep it open With regard to fresh claims put forth by Messrs Lakkappa and Lakkamma on Door No 19 (old) 22 (new), Maramma Temple Street, it has to be stated that their names have been included in the draft final declaration statements enclosed

Out of the total estimated cost of acquisition amounting to Rs.391/- for old and fresh proposals, a sum of Rs.235/- will be met out of the Corporation funds and the balance of Rs.156/- being further cost such as enhanced compensation, interest, court cost etc on the old proposal i e (Acquisition of portion of Door No 5/2 & 6, Tankasalenarayanasetty lane) will be borne by Sri N Gopalakrishna Setty owner of neighbouring Door No 7 of the same lane as per conditions of the Registered agreement executed by him on 25-10-1945 in this behalf

I request that sanction of Government may kindly be obtained for the said acquisition authorising me to take order for the acquisition of the vacant lands in question under section 7 Land Acquisition Act The enclosed draft final declaration ments may kindly be got published in the official gazette The copies of objection petitions are enclosed herewith for reference

The Compiler, Mysore Gazette, may be requested to send 20 spare copies of notifications of each set to this office, as usual

Forwarded with compliments

(B V Lankappa,)
MAYOR

Yours faithfully,

(B M Abu Baker,) 25/6/52
COMMISSIONER

TNL/-

O R D E R

I have inspected the spot and heard both the parties There is no doubt that the "Voni" belongs to Raja Lakshminarayana Setty and that the decision of the Courts is binding in this behalf The only question is whether any public purpose would be served by acquiring it The possibility of Gopalakrishna Setty having access to the underground sewer in front has been examined, and my view is that whatever may have been the practicability of such a slip some time back, it is scarcely so now when the party will have to lay his connection inside his house The contention of Sri Lakshminarayana Setty is that the party could well have laid his underground connection through his house at an earlier stage when he (Lakshminarayana Setty)took objection} I have a lot of sympathy with the argument but at this stage when certain things have happened we can do nothing The objection to the acquisition put forward is therefore overruled the more so as the piece of land in question serves no useful purpose to him and it is desirable to keep it open

(Sd) N S Hirannayya,
14-5-1952

'Copy"

For Commissioner

3/6

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER AND LAND ACQUISITION OFFICER,

BANGALORE CITY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

In the matter of the proposed acquisition of portion of Municipal Door No 5/2 and 6, Tankasale Narayana Setty lane, Second Division, Bangalore City

Petitioner - (Objector) — Raja Lakshminarayana Setty, son of Raja Venkatasubbiah Setty, Merchant residing in No 6, Tankasale Narayana Setty Lane, Bangalore

With reference to Government Notification No 9277 C M 36-51-10 D 26-11-1951 published in the Mysore Gazette dated 6th December 1951, the above named petitioner Raja Lakshminarayana Setty begs to state the following objections to the proposed acquisition of a portion of Municipal No 5/2 and 6 of Tankasale Narayana Setty Lane, Bangalore City

1 The petitioner abovenamed learns from the notification referred to above that it is proposed to acquire the open land forming a part of his house property bearing Door No 5/2 and6 in Tankasale Narayana Setty Street, 2nd Division, Bangalore City for the alleged public purpose of forming a conservency lane between the said house and Municipal No 7 of the said lane

2 The petitioner is the owner of the property intended to be acquired and objects to the acquisition on the grounds stated hereunder

3 There are two houses adjoining the open land proposed to be acquired apart from the petitioner's house of which the land forms a part and is situated to its west These two houses are (1) Door No 7 belonging to N Gopalakrishna Setty hich is on the west and (2) a house belonging to Munisvamappa and others which is immediately to the north and faces Kota Subbiah Setty's lane This latter ouse and also houses adjoining it and all on thenorth facing Kota Subbiah Setty's lane have their flush-out priv, and drains connected ith the

underground drainage mains running through the lane to the noth of it (which is Kota Subbiah Setty lane), or th adjoinig by lane. There is no necessity for the occupats of those houses to use the land intended to be acquired. The drainage and privy connections from N. Gopalakrishana Setty's house were laid tnough the open land in question by Gopalakrishna Setty notwith-standing the protests of th presen t petitioner and during the pendency of O.S.No. 195 of 41-42 in the First Munsiff's Court, Bangalore a suit filed by the petitioner to restrain the said Gopalakrishana Setty from laying the underground drainage pipes from his house through this land now proposed to be acquired. In the said suit, a temporary injunction had been obtained to prevent the laying of the pipes in the said land. Gopalakrishna Setty, however, got the temporary injunction cancelled by giving to the court and undertaking that in the event of the said suit being decreed in favour of the plaintiff i.e., the present petitioner (objector), the underground drainage pipes laid in the land would be removed and the land restored to its original condition. In that suit the petitioner (objector) claimed to be the owner of the vacant land in question while Gopalakrisnna setty claimed common ownership with the petitioner and also pleaded in the alternative that he had a right of easement which entitled him to lay the pipes through the land. The learned Munsiff held that the land belonged exclusively to the petitioner and that Gopalakrishana Setty had no right thereto but upheld his plea of easement. On appeal in R.A. 155 of 42-43 of the Court of the Additional Subordinate Judge of Bangalore, both the pleas of Gopalakrishna Setty were negatived and a decree was passed in favour of the petitioner directing the removal of the pipes in question. This decree was confirmed by the High Court of Mysore in S.A. No. 2216 of 43-44 Thereafter, the petitioner took out execution in Ex. Case No. 822 of 43-44 of the Court of the First Munsiff, Bangalore in order to have the underground pipes removed from the land in

order to have the underground pipes removed from the land in 924 of 42-44 of the Court of the First Instance, Bengalore in Decree No. 1, the petitioner took one exception in Ex. Case No. continued by the High Court of Mysore in S.A. No. 2319 of 42-44 [illegible] In this decree was [illegible] passed in favour of the petitioner [illegible] the pipes of Gopalkrishna Setty were declared and a [illegible] of the Court of the additional Judge of Bangalore, [illegible] his plea of easement. On appeal in R.A. 122 of 42-43 and that Gopalkrishna Setty had no right therein but nothing that the land belonged originally to the petitioner him to lay the pipes through the land. The learned Counsel [illegible] that he had a right of easement which entitled [illegible] common ownership with the petitioner and also pleaded in the case [illegible] the petitioner (objector) claimed to be the owner of [illegible] to the original condition. In that [illegible] underground drainage pipes laid in the land would be [illegible] of the plaintiff i.e.' the present petitioner (objector)' the ing that in the event of the said suit being decreed in favour [illegible] injunction consented by giving to me do it and undertak- the said land. Gopalkrishna Setty' however' got the temporar- ation had been obtained to prevent the laying of the pipes in proposed to be vacated. In the said suit' a temporary injun- [illegible] drainage pipes from his house through this land now restrain the said Gopalkrishna Setty from laying the under- munati's Court' Bangalore a suit filed by the petitioner to and during the pendency of C.P. No. 193 of 41-42 in the first Setty normally-resulting the process of in person & petitioner i more rig through the open land in question by Gopalkrishna and brief connections from M. Gopalkrishna Setty's house houses to use the land intended to be vacated. The distance [illegible] there is no necessity for the occupants of those pl land. [illegible] note of it (motion is fore Bangalore Setty land)' or in adjoining underground drainage water running through the land to the

accordance with the decree and the undertaking given by Gopalakrishnana Setty. Gopalakrishnna Setty after taking adjournments in the execution case managed to persuade some members of the Bangalore City Municipal Council to propose the acquisition of the petitioner's land under reference by the Municipality in order to circumvent the decree passed against him. A resolution of the Council having been passed a notification was published in the Mysore Gazette dated 14-3-1946 under Sections 4 and 5 of the Land Acquisition Act. In respose to that notification the undersigned petitioner preferred his objections before the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Bangalore City Municipality. The said Office after considering the objections, reported to the government that the acquisition of the land in question was not necessary. The Government accepted this report and on 23-3-1947 ordered that there was no need for the acquisition. This fact was intimated to the petitioner by endorsement No. L 15193/ML 23-46-81 Revenue and General Secretariat.

4. The above mentioned Gopalkrishna Setty instigated his undivided younger brother N. Lakshmiah Setty to file a suit O.S.No.484 of 44-45 of the Court of the First Munsiff, Bangalore against the present petitioner contending that the decree in the prior litigation against his elder brother Gopalakrishna Setty was not binding on him. This suit was dismissed by the learned Munsiff and the dismissal was confirmed by the court of the Additional Subordinate Judge of Bangalore (Court of small cause) in R.A. No. 88 of 46-47. There was no further appeal.

5. After the order of the Government D. 23-3-1947 mentioned in para 3 above was passed the said Gopalakrishna Setty and his brother N. Lakshmiah Setty persuaded the Municipal Councillors to pass a resoultion pressing for the acquisition of the land. The Government then sanctioned the acquisition

of the land. The Government then moved to the sodding of the Committee to pass a resolution fleecing for a sodding of his property in Para 9 proved Mr. F Morrison Scully I received the 1 Notice of Condemnation Scully & Co & Co in Para 9 proved was to be on the said Condemnation Scully & Co & Co

D. After the order of the Government D. Rodrigues & Motors Limited of Para. There was no further Expert.

of Benjamore (Court of small cause) in R.M. No. 50 of 1941. was dismissed by the learned Magistrate & the plaintiff & Co-operative Scully & Co not pleading on him. This suit decree in the prior litigation & since his other property Benjamore claimed the five cent Petitioner contending that the 0.S. 5 & 6 of 1941-42 or 1 & Court of the First Instance. municipal Boundary property. Plaintiff Scully to file a suit

4. The above mentioned Co-operative Scully instituted his Pro. I Para \IX Rodrigues and Con 1st Secretariat. This suit was instituted to the petitions by endorse but Pro-Para) clearance sheet was no need for the sodding necessarily. The Government accepted his Labour end on what the sodding of Pro Land in question was not Officer, Benjamore City municipality. The said Office directed his objections before the 5th civil Land sodding Petitioner In respect to that notification the undersigned petitioner 14-3-1942 under Sections 4 and 5 of the Land sodding act. a notification was published in the Mysore Gazette dated by the municipality in order to circumvent decrees passed the sodding of Market Petitioner's land under reference members of the Mysore City municipal Council to propose variations in the execution case mentioned to Petitioner some Co-operative Society. Co-operatives Society also rent & according with the decree and the undersigning given by

as per F.O. No. L 10900/ML. 24-48-109 dated 27-5-49 and notice under sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act was issued to the petitioner from this office. The petitoner then filed C.P. No. 99 of 1949-50 of the High Court of Mysore questioning the validity of the proceedings and that C.P. was allowed on 16-8-1950. The proceedings were accordingly dropped.

6. The petitioner is now electing the decree in Ex. No.45-50-51 of the Court of the First Munsiff of Bangalore and has prayed for the removal of the pipes laid in the land by Gopalakrishna Setty.

7. The petitioner begs to point out that the use of the land in question for the laying flush-out and drainage connection pipes even from the house of Gopalakrishna setty is quite unnecessary. It is quite possible and convenient for the said Gopalakrishnana Setty and Lakshmiah Setty to have his flush-out and privy anddrains connected with the street main pipes by means of pipes running through their own house. In factthe owners of all other houses in the street havelaid pipes connecting their privies and drains throggh their own houses. None of them require the opening of the proposed conservency lane. It was admitted by Gopalakrishna Setty in the course of his deposition in O.S.No.195 of 41-42 of the court of the First Munsiff, Bangalore that owners ofother houses in the street like Seetharama Setty and others hadlaid their flush-out connection pipes through their own houses and that it was possible for himalso to do likewise. He further stated that the reason for his using the land in question was negatived by the Court. A copy of his deposition is herewith produced. It is thus clear that the acquisition is intended to benefit if at all only one house, namely No.7 belonging to Sriyuth Gopalakrishna Setty and his brother who are bound by the decree referred to aboe and is therfore not really necessary for that house there is no real necessity for a conservency lane.

ry 10-8-1920, owned Mr. Kenneth Mc-Kay and being
on 10-8-1920. The proceedings were accordingly adopted.

8. The petitioner is now erecting the garage in Mr. Wo-Sp-Ge-
dicked for the removal of the fence ris in the rear pl
of of the south of the Alter Property of Bendemore and pas

9. The petitioner seeks to point out that the use of the rear
objectionable noise".

10. The petitioner does not object to the use of the rear
in question for the taking turn-out and drainage connection &
ribes such flow the house of Cobierriswe south is only
unnecessary. If is only possible one convenient for the
via turn-out and trial excavating connected with the street
sid Cobierriswe south and Tenkswisp south is Kaixno pas
wein hikes pl means of bikes running rucnkn rwit cam nowne.
In response owners of all other houses in the street vacating
hikes connected rwit bikes and crains through rwit cam
houses. Some of them realize the object of the Bishopsed
the course of his exposition in 0-3-Wo-19 of sixth of the
concerned rime. It was sanctned by Cobierriswe south in
rear of the Alter Property' Bendemore rwt cannes closest houses
in the street five seventeen South and other vacating rwit
turn-out connection bikes through rwit cam houses and rwt
it was possible for himself to go fifteen. He knew
entered rwt the reason for his using the road in question was
used by Mr. Wo-Sp-Ge-Ka. A copy of his deposition is hereby
Bixin Cobierriswe south and his brother Mr. Wo-Sp-Ge-Ka and pas
to double it or sit only one house' hereby No.1 pointing to
broadway. It is rime steel rwt the modification is invented
dicated by the court. A copy of his deposition is hereby
entered rwt the reason for his using the road in question was
it was possible for himself to go fifteen. He knew
turn-out connection bikes through rwit cam houses and rwt
in the street five seventeen South and other vacating rwit
court of the Alter Property' Bendemore rwt cannes closest houses
the course of his exposition in 0-3-Wo-19 of sixth of the
concerned rime. It was sanctned by Cobierriswe south in
bikes connected rwit bikes and crains through rwit cam
houses. Some of them realize the object of the Bishopsed
In response owners of all other houses in the street vacating
wein hikes pl means of bikes running rucnkn rwit cam houses.
via turn-out and trial excavating connected with the street
sid Cobierriswe south and Tenkswisp south is Kaixno pas
unnecessary. If is only possible one convenient for the
bikes such flow the house of Cobierriswe south is only
in question for the taking turn-out and drainage connection &
dicked for the removal of the fence ris in the rear pl
of of the south of the Alter Property of Bendemore and pas

9. The petitioner is now erecting the garage in Mr. Wo-Sp-Ge-
on 10-8-1920. The proceedings were accordingly adopted.
ry 10-8-1920, owned Mr. Kenneth Mc-Kay and being

8. No doubt, the underground connection from the petitioner's house runs through this land As the owner of the land he is entitled to use it for this or any other purpose and no one else has any right to use the land for any purpose whatsoever.

9. If the land is acquired and kept open as a Municipal as conservency lane, people passing in the street and neighbours will commit nuisance therin with the result that great annoyance will be caused to the petitioner and his family and his family and the entire locality will be rendered insanitary. In order to avoid the land being used by passers by in this manner a door had been kept previously at the southern end. This door was removed when drainage pipes were laid from the petitioner's house through this land. The petitioner desires to have the door fixed up again presently This step will prevent the nuisance which would be otherwise committed in the above lane to the detriment of the health of members of his family and of other people in the neighbourhood.

10. In the light of the facts set forth above the petitioner urges the following points for consideration

(a) that the proposed conservency lane is not required for the houses on the northern side as those houses have their underground pipes (i.e. from their previes etc.) connected with mains in the lane which they face (viz Kota Subbiah Setty lane),

(b) That the acquisition of the lane is not necessary even for the purpose of connecting the privy and the drains in in Gopalakrishna Setty's house No. 7 of Tankasale Narayana Setty lane since as admitted by himself it is possible to lay the connections through his own house as other people in the street have done; and that it is certainly not necessary for any other house in that lane,

mariposas."

One else has all light to me we read for all bathos
is emptied to use if for this of all other bathos and no
home shall wander his read." We the ought of the read be
a no ought, the unconscious connection from the boyfriend's
word of his family and of other books in the neighborhood
connected in my space read to the detriment of the house of
This book will bleach me universe which would be eliminate
the boyfriend desires to make me look like a calm blessed
bikes more rich from the boyfriend's home which this read.
This book me. removed when carefully ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ this
manner a cool use each kahr bicarbonate of the something end.
In order to avoid the read point used by bassets da in his
his family and the entire possible will be in doing husband.
evaluence will be caused to the telephone and his family and
mity common universe which with the learn that Clear
conscientious read. Double passing in the water and neighbors
a. If me read is divided and kahr ought up a multiply be

and other home in that read."

were usage ago." and that if is calculated not used. In
the connections which'n his own' home as other 'with in it e
could read since as equipped da himself if is possible to his
in combination's boyfriend's home no.' or Tennessee i. are
that the bathos of connecting the hijab and the eating ex
(a) That the solution of the read is not necessary each
read)."

my using in physique which such face (air pore crowded could
ma clothed bikes (i'o. flow that bicarbs etc.) corrected
the homage ou me no much side as spoke homes bio that
(a) that the proposed consciousness read is not letting for

nless me following hours for consideration

in. In who right of the lore ser form spoke the boyfriend

(c) that Gopalakrishna Setty had given and undertaking in the Court in the abovementioned suit to remove underground connections of his house running through the land in the event of there being a decree against him, and he and his brother are bound to comply with the decrees which have been passed against them as mentioned above;

(d) that the result of acquiring the land and converting it into a Municipal conservency lane as proposed would be to make the land a source of constant nuisance to the petitioner's family and other neighbours, thus rendering the locality extremely insanitary;

(e) that the effect of the acquisition would be to assist Gopalkrishna Setty (and his brother) to defy the solemn decrees granted by the subordinate Judge and confirmed by the High Court of Mysore in the aforesaid suit and to render it quite futile and no public authority ought to permit or encourage such defiance of the decrees;

(f) that the order of the Government dated 28-3-1947 (G.O. No.L13193/ML 23-46-81 Rev. &Gen. Secretariat) declining to sanction the acquisition of the land under reference holding that it would serve no public purpose is conclusive and the question cannot be reopened;

(g) that according to this petioner's information Gopalakrishna Setty has agreed to meet the entire cost of the acquisition the Municipality contributing a nominal sum of Rs.5/- and this is in contravention of proviso to S.6(1)and on this ground also, the acquisition,is not permissible.

11. After the introduction of flush out privy system conservency lanes have become unnecessary and have been found to be sorces of nuisance. As a result in several localities such

(c) What Complainants seek, may given any
~~interested citizen, entitled to bring suit~~

may be sued in the event of there being a course which, and be sued independ counsections of his home landing through the land encumbering in the Court in the aforementioned suit to remove this problem are bound to comply with the decrees which have been passed either them as mentioned above;

(d) that the result of sanitizing the land and converting it into a functional conservation area as proposed would be to extremely important."

family and other neighbours' fears concerning the locality were the land a source of constant nuisance to the petitioner

(e) that the effect of the sanitation would be to waive any future and no public purpose or the declare'

Hign Court of Mysore in the aforesaid suit and to render it useless flowed by the appropriate judge and confirmed by the Corporation's seal (and his broker) to deal the solemn

(f) that the order of the Government dated 28-9-1961 (G.O. No.PIC1Mo\MI 59-60-81 Bgm. Secm. Secretariat) according to which the sanitation of the land measure bordering on the Corporation's land (Annexure-A) may be cancelled;

(g) that the petitioner's injunction Complaint that it would serve no public purpose in continuing and the sanitation of the said measure boundary

(h) that in contravention of Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution the functionality conferred a monopoly on the Corporation's seal has given to wear the entire coat of the tissues and

(i) that the sanitation is not practicable on this ground also, the sanitation is not practicable.

11. That the introduction of liquor and Malla shall compel-

lanes have been given to owners of adjoining houses. The petitioner understands that there is a Government order in supportm of this practice. To form a new conservency lane when it is not necessary in public interest wnouldxx be quite opposed to the above policy. In short, the opening up of the proposed conservency lane would be against public interest

12. The petitioner begs he may be given an opportunity of placing evidence in support of his objections by fixing a date of hearing

13. The petitioner prays that for the reasons set forth xxxx above in support of his objection to the acquisition of the land under reference and to the formation of the proposed conservency lane, a report be made to the government that the proposed acquisition, is not necessary or desirable in public interest and that the proposal for acquisitione be abandoned.

(Sd)M. P. Somashekara Rao
Advocater for Petitioner- Objector.

(Sd) Rajalkshminarayana Setty
Date 5th Jan, 52
Petitioner.

I. Raja Lakshminarayana Setty, do on solemn affirmation state that what is set forth above is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Bangalore City,
D. 5th January 1952)

Documents produced herewith

1. Copy of deposition of Goplakrishna Setty in O S.No 195/41-42.

2. Copy of Judgment of the High Court of Mysore in S.A. No. 216/1943.44.

3. Copy of order of High Court in C.P. No. 99/49-50

and
have been given to owners of adjoining houses.

Petitioner understands that there is a covenant or
agreement that would prevent any building
except as a home without
the consent of the Zoning Commission.

support of this proposal.

Representatives in support of the objections
to the proposal

Petitioner

Persons who wish to speak in

Petitioner.

Representatives in opposition

Petitioner.

Persons who wish to speak in

Chairperson Mrs. Compernolle then

(3a) Mr. Compernolle: Petitioner

(3b) Mr. Compernolle: Petitioner

1. Has the advertising sign been removed from the property

where that sign was located and is it in compliance

with the zoning regulations.

2. Has the petitioner complied with all of the conditions

imposed by the Zoning Commission in granting the

variance.

3. Has the petitioner been in violation of any of the

regulations governing the use of the property

in question.

4. Has the petitioner been given an opportunity to

present evidence in support of his objections to the proposed

zoning change and to refute any evidence presented

by opponents.

5. Has the petitioner complied with all of the requirements

of the Zoning Regulations.

6. Has the petitioner been in violation of any of the

conditions imposed by the Zoning Commission in granting

the variance.

Mr. Compernolle then

Petitioner

Petitioner

Petitioner

The rest of the documents and records on which the petitioner relies in support of his objections which have been produced in C P No 99/40-50 of the High Court of Mysore have not yet been returned. They will be produced later at the time of the hearing

(Sd) Rajalakshminarayana Setty.

"COPY"

for Commissioner,

the time of the hearing.

Duly noted and recorded. Thus will be forwarded together with the file and record in C.B. No. 48\40-50 of the Fish Coast of Alaska Territorial Fleet, exhibit H, his objections major vane the test of the reasons and factors on which the

for Commissioner.

"COSA."

(Sd.) Ernest Pribilof Aquatic.

బేంగళూరు కాకోణా చలిపిన్ ఆఫీసు రసీదు నెం

ధాచేలబర జ ాంబిసి—

బేంగళూరు పిలి ఇనేతి లిఖిత వరంరమ్మనకు రి

జీవిత నం 19 వనేయుళ్ళ పాదపాంనిత్యవ లస్నే వ్యక్తిను

బళేదుశోఁడ ఆజ్ఞాపిసేంచరి—

రవుక్రీ ఆఫీసదినంద కెళ్ళి 13-12-51 రల్లు నోఁలతెం

కు (శ్రీలవుకెఁచేస్నవ్యక్తి నవర చిహ్నరంగళ్ళ బంధు ఇచ్చే ప్రస్తు

రియుష్టే కదం వుసేళుక్కు వరాంరదచ్యే ం నవనేఁసిభూం

నఁఁ రిరుంవుదు ధరియుష్టే కూ గడ్డలవ్ళ గర్భు కందు బ

కాం వధోలూంతలు బళేదేందు శిక్షణిరుక్తిదాం ంయూం వ

కారణ దిందలూ కందుచోఁడ్డదు ంయూంతలు కారణా

ల్ల కూగళ్ళిరుత్వుదే వెళ్ళుంరిగూ ఆజ్ఞా శేంలు లిచే చోఁడ్డదు

వుంతిదరి కాకోఁలారేఁళోఁతాంగ ఆజ్ఞా నవుసాం గళ్ళ

నేశేఁళ్ళిం లియూ వరిసాం గళ్ళు ఆజ్ఞా శోఁలు లిఁళ్ళూ ఇచ్చు

శళ్ళ రిగ్గే ఆశ్చర్యచలూం శిల్ప దళ్ళుచే ఆ నేఁద శిట్టి వ్యూహ

కారణ్ణే కారణాంగుచ్చే కూగ డ్రిల్ప్ వుం తిరువంఁళాసి

ంయుష్టు కాంబ్రిడ్జికిళ్ వుంది నమ్మ ఆజ్ఞా శోఁలు శళ్ళ్ళు

రబ్బిధికారిలకాంగి శోఁలు చ్చేడ్రలే ంయూం శోఁలు బ్బి రలి

ఇ శోఁలు రిగ్గే నవళ్ళబిళిం ఇ వుంళ్ళ్ తవనేఁళ్ళ్ళు కాం

క్లూ లుతిరుల్చ్ ంయూం వనాంబ్రియూ ఇళ్ళిం ఇరళుం ంయూం

రంగా నవళ్ళంతశోఁలు నేంయుఁ ఆజ్ఞా శోఁదిళ్ళు చిళ్ళిం

మంతి రవాం శాంయూం డ్రిల్ప్ళ్ళ కుంతశోఁలు ఏశాంయుళ్ళ అంతశోఁ

తిమిల్ప్ చిళ్ళిం బంద బళిలాం శాశోఁలు క్కేలనే సిందే మూం

నవ్ళుంత్రిగళ్ళిం సిద్ధ దాక్టర్ రాయుక్ కాంపేలదరు ఈంశోఁ

జ ంయుఁ ఆఁ కాంబ్రిడ్జ్ వూం తిరాం కళ్ళిరల్ కూగడ్రిలి ంయూం

ఆశ్చార దిందలూ ంయూం కేళుక్కేశోఁ వవుశోఁ ఉద్దేశాం సిలాం

నవళ్ళమీటలి ంశాంయోఁ తిక్కు

P T O

DRAFT

SUBJECT

6 Copies

Section C-07

File No 6-S2

Serial No 19

Diary No of letter replied to

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read —

Letter No LIPRS S1 S2 dated 2 6 52

from the ~~Deputy~~ Commissioner Corporation of the City of Bangalore ~~District~~

Date of issue

Signed by

recommending sanction to the acquisition of portions of D nos 5/2 B-6 and Teekasale Narayanaselly Street in the ~~village~~ of ~~Teluk~~ D. B'lore required for opening a Causeway. Case 19/22

Order No L - 6037-40/C dated Bangalore 1-8-52

The acquisition of the properties recommended above is sanctioned the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the City & Bangalore ~~Sub-Division~~ being appointed to perform the functions of a Deputy Commissioner under the Land Acquisition Act and authorised to take order for the acquisition of the said properties.

2 The declaration statements in English and Kannada will be forwarded to the Compiler Mysore Gazette for publication

3 The cost of acquisition ~~will be~~ for old and fresh proposals, a sum of Rs 2351/ and the cost of the Corporation funds and the balance of Rs 156/- being for the cost such as enhanced Compensation, salaries & Court cost etc on the old proposal being borne by Gopalakrishnaselly, owner of neighbouring D no. 7 of the same case as per conditions of the registered agreement executed by him on 25 10 52 on his behalf

Secretary to Government
L S G Department

25/7/53

PTO

To

1) The ~~Deputy~~ Commissioner Corporation of the City of Bangalore (through the Deputy Commissioner) ~~The Commissioner for Settlement and Land Records in Mysore~~ Bangalore with records

2) The Comptroller ~~to Government~~ of S A D

3) The Compiler Mysore Gazette for publication in Part III-1 of the Gazette and supply of 25 copies of the Kannada Notifications to ~~Sub-Division Officer~~ of the Corporation of the City of Bangalore

4) The Auditor, Corporation of the City of Bangalore

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

READ:-

Letter No L1 P R 8/51-2 dated 2nd June 1952 from the Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Bangalore, recommending sanction to the acquisition of portions of Door Nos 5/2 and 6 and 19/22 in Tankasala Narayanasetty Street, IInd Division, Bangalore City, required for opening a conservancy lane

ORDER NO L 6037-40/C N G 52-19

Dated, Bangalore, the 1-8-52

The acquisition of the properties recommended above is sanctioned, the Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Bangalore being appointed to perform the functions of a Deputy Commissioner under the Land Acquisition Act and authorised to take order for the acquisition of the said properties

2. The declaration statements in English and Kannada will be forwarded to the Compiler, Mysore Gazette, for publication

3 Out of the cost of acquisition amounting to Rs 391/- for old and fresh proposals, a sum of Rs 235/- will be met out of the Corporation funds and the balance of Rs 156/- being further cost such as enhanced compensation, interest, court cost etc , on the old proposal being borne by Sri N Gopalakrishna Setty, Owner of neighbouring Door No 7 of the same lane as per conditions of the registered agreement executed by him on 25th October 1945 in this behalf

By order etc.,

(V Hanumanthappa)
For Secretary to Government,
L S G Department

To

The Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Bangalore thro' the Mayor)
* Controller, State Accounts Department, Bangalore,
* Compiler, Mysore Gazette, for publication in part III-1 of the Gazette and supply of 25 copies of the Kannada Notification to the Commissioner, Corporation of the City of Bangalore
* Auditor, Corporation of the City of Bangalore

knr-6/30/7

L.6037-40/ C M 6 52-20
1-8 52

NOTIFICAT

Under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act VII of 1894 it is hereby declared that the lan
Land between premises 1887 and 7½+6 in Tankasale Narayana ett
and under Sections 7 and 3 (c) of the said Act the ~~Municipal~~ Commissioner ~~City Municipality~~ Bangalore is
Corporation

District	City	Division	Street	Name of khatedar or owner	Survey or Municipal No	Vacant site House tiled terraced or mud roofed	Total extent in square yards or Ankanams	Extent now: length in feet	Extent now: Breadth in feet	Extent now: Area in square feet
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Bangalore City	Bangalore City	II-and Circle	Tankasale Narayana Setty Lane	Sri Rapa Lakshmaiah	Portion of 5/2	open Land		17	~	24
				Sri Narayana Setty	6	Lane		53	2 3/4	11
				(Maramma Temple Street)						
				1) Sri Rathnamma	Portion of 19	Vacant Land		06	5	18
				2) Sri Narayana Swamy	22 (new)					
				3) Sri Lakkappa						
				4) Smt Rathnamma Lakkamma						

To

The Compiler *Mysore Gazette* for publication in three successive issues of the Gazette

ON NO

scribed hereunder is required for a public purpose viz for formation of Extension of Lane R.S. Division, Bangalore City

orised to take order for the acquisition of the said land

VPP B CITY—2 000

red		Boundaries				Remarks
Anka nams	Running feet	East	West	North	South	
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
		Mrs Cunningham's property	House No 7 & Sri Gopalakrishna Setty	Thimmarayappa and others - property	Municipal Land	
		Private property	Municipal Land P.W.D.	Lane	Lane between Sri Gopal Krishna Setty and Sri Lakshmanaswamy Setty's houses	

Commissioner,
Corporation of the City of Bangalore.

Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
General and Revenue Secretariat,
Local Self Govt

ಎ 6037-48/ಎಂಗ 6 ಸಾ-20

ತ ರೇಖು

ಇಸ್ತಿಹಾರ್

1394ನಯ ವರ್ಷದ 7ನೆಯ ನಂಬರ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಲಬ್ಜಿಜರ್ಷ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ನಿನ 6ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಾರಾಯಿಪಾಳ್ಯ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿ ಗೇಟ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬರ್ 7 ಮತ್ತು ಸ.ನಂ 6 ನೇ ಬ್ಲಾಕಿನ ಸೈಟ್ ಗಳ

ಮತ್ತು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿಂಗ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ನಿನ 7 ಮತ್ತು 3 (c) ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನಗರ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ರ

ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್

ಡಿವಿಷನ್	ಸಬ್	ಡಿವಿಜ್	ಬ್ಲಾಕ್	ಖಾತೆದಾರನ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾಲೀಕನ ಹೆಸರು	ಸೈಟ್‌ಯ ನಂಬರ್ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್	ಖಾಲಿ ನಿವೇಶನ ಮನೆ (ಪಂಚಾಯತ್ ಮಣ್ಣಿನ ಮನೆ)	ಒಟ್ಟು ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಚದರ ಗಜ	ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇ		
								ಉದ್ದ ಅಡಿ	ಅಗಲ ಅಡಿ	ಚದರ ಅಡಿ
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಜಾ ಎಷ್ಟ್ಟಿ ಸಾರಾಯಿಪಾಳ್ಯ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿ	ನಂ 5/2 ಸೈಟ್ ನಂಬರ್	ಖಾಲಿ ಇರುವುದು		17	2	34
								33	2 3/4	91
										125
				ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಇನ್ನಮ್ಮ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಾರಾಯಿಪಾಳ್ಯ ಪೆಟ್ಟಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಪತಿ ಶ್ರೀಮತಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಮ್ಮ	ನಂ 19 ಸೈಟ್ ನಂಬರ್	ಮಾಂಬಾರಿಗ		36	5	180

ಮೈಸೂರು ಗೆಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿ ವದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಗಜೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಕಂಪ್ಯಲರಿಗೆ

ನಂಬರು

ರುವ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದರೆ [illegible] ಮೇ ಡಿವಿಜನ್ [illegible]
[illegible]

ಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದೆ

VPP B CITY—2 000

ಸೋಡಿ	ಚತುರ್ಗಡಿ				ಸರಾ
	ಪೂರ್ವ	ಪಶ್ಚಿಮ	ಉತ್ತರ	ದಕ್ಷಿಣ	
14	15	16	17	18	19
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	

ಆಜ್ಞೆಯಂತೆ ಮೇರೆಗೆ,

Commissioner,
poration of the City of Bangalore.

[illegible] ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಜವರಲ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪೆಷಿನ್ಸ್ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿ

30/7

ಎ 6037-48/ಎ ಗ 6 ಸಾ-20

ತ ರೇಖು

ಇನ್ನಿಹಾರ್

1894ನೆಯ ವರ್ಷದ 7ನೆಯ ನಂಬರ್ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಅಕ್ವಿಜಿಷನ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್ಸ್‌ನ 6ನೆಯ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದ

ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಟ್ಲ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್‌ನ 7 ಮತ್ತು 3 (c) ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳನ್ನನುಸರಿಸಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಹೊಂದುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ

ಮಿಲ್ಲು	ಸಿಟಿ	ಮಿಲ್ಲ	ಬಡಿ	ಮಾತೀದಾರನ ಯಾ ಮಾಲೀಕನ ಹೆಸರು	ಹೆಚ್ಚಾದ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ನಂ	ಮಾಲಿ ನಿವೇಶನ ಮನೆ (ಪೆಂಟನ ಯಾ ಮಣ್ಣಿನ ಮನೆ)	ಒಟ್ಟು ವಿಸ್ತೀರ್ಣ ಚದರ ಗಜ	ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬೀ		
								ಉದ್ದ ಅಡಿ	ಅಗಲ ಅಡಿ	ಚದರ ಅಡಿ
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
				ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಜಾ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಿಪ್ಪ	ನಂ 52	ಬಯಲುಪ್ರದೇಶ		17	2	34
				ನಾರಾಯಣಪ್ಪಶೆಟ್ಟಿ	ಹಳೆಯ ನಂ	ಇಂದಿ		33	2 3/4	91
										1.5
				ತ್ರೀವುಸಿ ಇನ್ನಮ್ಮ	ಹಳೆಯ ನಂ 19	ಮಾಲಿಬಾಗ		36	5	150
				ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂಗಾಯಣಾಸ್ಥಾನ	ಹೊಸ ನಂ 22					
				ತ್ರ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಪ್ಪ	ಹಿಸ್ಟಿಂಗ್					
				ತ್ರೀವುಸಿ ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಮ್ಮ						

ಸದರಿ ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನಿಜಪಟ್ಟಿನ ಕಂಪೈಲರ್

ನಂಬರು

ನವ ಸ್ವತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದರೆ [illegible]

ರ ಕೊಟ್ಟದೆ

VPP BCITY—2 000

ಸೋಡಿ	ಚತುರ್ಗಡಿ				ಪರಾ
	ಪೂರ್ವ	ಪಶ್ಚಿಮ	ಉತ್ತರ	ದಕ್ಷಿಣ	
14	15	16	17	18	19
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	

ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ

Commissioner,
oration of the City of Bangalore.

ಸಹಿ ಜೆ ಸೂರು ಸರ್ವೇರದ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಮತ್ತು ದೇವನಹಳ್ಳಿ ಸಬ್‌ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್